

FRport of the Proceedings of the 104th Autumn Delegate Meeting of the
Socialist Party of Great Britain on Saturday the 18th and Sunday the 19th
of October 2008

At 52 Clapham High Street, London SW4 7UN

A Election of the Chair, Deputy Chair and Tellers

Motion 1 (Johnson, Swansea and Chesham, Central London) “That Alan Johnstone of Edinburgh be nominated for the Chair”. Agreed unanimously

Motion 2 (Johnson Swansea and Whitfield Lancaster) “That Standing Orders act as Tellers and that a Deputy Chair be elected should it be necessary”. Agreed

B No fraternal greetings received.

C East Anglia Regional Branch and Central London Branch both had late Forms C.

Motion 3 (Stevens, EARB and Shannon, Lancaster) “That delegates for those branches be allowed to sit”. Agreed

West Midlands Branch delegates without credentials.

Motion 4 (Johnson, Swansea and Anderson, Edinburgh) “That the delegates be allowed to sit”. Agreed

D The late reports from the Internet Department, (mislaidd in the Computer system) and the AD Hoc Committee on Party Finance be accepted.

Motion 5 (Johnson, Swansea and Simkins, South London) “That items 32, 33, 34 and 35 be taken together”. Agreed

Agreed to take items 28 and 29 together.

Motion 6 (Chesham, Central London and Johnson, Swansea) “That item 7 an item for discussion from Glasgow Branch be re-scheduled for Sunday”, to allow full participation. Agreed

Bennett (Manchester) raised a Point of Order. Why was the Conference instruction that a Sound System be fitted for ADM. not carried out.

No satisfactory answer was made so the Chair advised that this matter be raised at Conference.

Chesham (Central London) said that it was planned to record the evening meeting and that two microphones were in place for use by delegates if they so chose

The Chair read the instructions of the Fire Emergency Plan to the meeting.

E

1 Report of the General Secretary

Accepted

2 Report of the Central Organiser.

Vanni (Glasgow) questioned how members in the North East were met with, singly or as a group?

Johnson (Swansea) Is concerned over the lack of dues for a number of years now, only activity is the Durham Miners Gala and the Festival. Newcastle will have to fold.

Buick (Central Organiser) reported that he had met with a group of members and saw accounts. If they fold members will have to go into Central Branch, Edinburgh or even Lancaster.

3 Report – Membership Applications

Johnson (Swansea) Has not been able to find the Information Pack for new members, we have run out and we need a volunteer to get a new one together.

Browne (Standing Orders) Asked what sort of question are people falling down on?

Bennett (Membership Committee) Answered that Religion was one.

4 Ad Hoc Committee on Party Decision Making.

Johnstone (Chair) said that we would take contributions from branches who had responded

first.

There were no comments from South London, East Anglian Regional Branch or West London.

Buick (Ad Hoc Committee) said that in the rule book there is provision for a model Branch Standing Orders, The branches were asked for comments . The aim was to try to bring branch Standing Orders up to date and allow for phone voting. Number 4 is controversial, it will have to be accepted by Conference.

Bennett (Manchester) A view in his branch was that Standing Orders for electronic voting should be completely separate, perhaps this is what Item 4 does.

Miller (Ad Hoc Committee) A separate set of Standing Orders was their intention.

5 Report of Central Branch

Vanni (Glasgow) Good that the numbers have decreased, how was this achieved? The idea that Central Branch could ever function as a normal branch will never happen. They should all be transferred.

Johnson (Central Branch Secretary) said that he and Fred Allen had got together, Reluctant payers were told to request waiving, some chose to lapse, some requested dues to be waived. Some transferred to EARB, SWRB or Manchester Branch. Action was taken against overseas members because of loss of contact. They were given ample opportunity to stay, return post-paid at £2 each were sent, 30 went out. In 2010 he will be editing again. He concedes defeat on a functioning Central Branch; only 26 members seem to be active. There is a purpose for a Central Branch, living a distance away, they are unable to participate

6 Item for Discussion: "Sanctions other than expulsion" Manchester Branch.

Bennett (Manchester) said that the intention of the branch was to open this up for discussion. They did not have a consensus in the branch and their discussion was very general. The issue was that we should have something available which was less draconian than expulsion. Members have rights and duties, and could be deprived of some or all of the rights of membership. The idea was to improve the members behaviour, not to get into a rules discussion.

Miller (Central London) Manchester have misinterpreted the rule on expulsion. The rule means incompatibility with party membership, depriving them of voting rights will not stop mistaken ideas.

Vanni (Glasgow) Manchester is encouraging the idea that no-one should be expelled. Was it draconian to expel the two London branches? Two years was spent on that procedure, they wouldn't have it. We should get this in perspective, he could only recall three individuals in 45 years, they were very serious offences, no-one since 1991. Glasgow has never charged anyone, Manchester branch have missed something, the vast majority of members don't do any of the things that Manchester would deprive them of. Very small number attends Conference or ADM. Only a small number vote, the average vote is 97 out of a membership of 300, these are no sanctions at all. There are no trivial charges in the Party. Any members who step out of line are talked to, we have procedures, they can defend their case or appeal. It's hard to get people into the Party but even harder to get them out. The procedure is adequate.

Buick (West London) A charge doesn't have to lead to expulsion, (Rule 31) it could be something else, trouble is once charged, all focus is on this event. Who decides sanctions? Two alternatives to expulsion, a) a reprimand and b) a warning.

Simpkins (South London) Historically I never voted for an expulsion, was against the expelling of the two London branches, did not regard them as non-Socialists, they just wanted to continue to use the Party name. It was a pantomime situation. Others who held incompatible views such as on the IRA. These members will come to recant or

leave, members are spoken to.

Chesham (Central London) Last contribution is moonshine, they don't leave, they hang around causing trouble. The two branches went against a Conference decision. Some members that he knows have contributed towards rival political parties.

Shannon (Lancaster) His branch quite sympathetic towards Manchester's ideas. Some speakers have shown that the mechanism for expulsion is unwieldy. Its destructive, demoralising, personalises, how can we deal with problems, we can't just turn a blind eye, we need this discussion.

Johnstone (Edinburgh) Manchester's suggestions vague, we do have on-line moderation; a person can be suspended temporarily, for abusive behaviour.

Stevens (EARB) Referring to the case of Phil Lancaster, where in the Rule book does it say, the EC. should set up a Committee?

Johnson (EC) Yes it's not in the Rule book, but with a Central Branch member, we needed clarity. He suggested an Ad Hoc Committee. this was better than immediate expulsion, which he would be reluctant to vote for.

Stevens (EARB) How did the EC decide on the Ad Hoc Committee?

Miller (EC) Had an interest in this issue as some of the postings were against me, but his political views were anti the Party. He only made an apology; he is still in the Party

Carter (EC) Was glad that Manchester branch had raised this issue as there was still a poisonous attitude hanging on. On the EC choice of the Ad Hoc Committee, largely it was people who could actually get together for a meeting but the main criteria was that none of us knew Phil Lancaster. At the suggestion of Lancaster Branch we co-opted Comrade Dougie McLellan, because he has experience of the particular mental illness that Comrade Lancaster suffers from, and would be able to tell if mental health was being used as a shield. The Committee were satisfied that Phil Lancaster was able to answer the questions on the Membership applications questionnaire; there was a little fuzziness on a couple of points, which we had a discussion about. He apologised, we felt sincerely, for his behaviour and volunteered to remove himself from the Party forums, so that he wouldn't be fired up by any controversy going on.

Bennett (Manchester) the contributions from South London and Central London branches were irrelevant. To a point from Glasgow, if expulsion merited, yes they should have been expelled. There are sanctions other than expulsion. Maybe these alternatives should be clearer, not suggesting easing up on expulsion but a gentler, easier way to deal with a problem.

7 Item for discussion: "The attempt made, probably from within the Party, to incriminate other members"(Glasgow).

It had been agreed that this item be deferred until the next day to allow for full participation.

8 Campaigns Department Report.

Vanni (Glasgow) Is it true that we are considering spending a lot of money on a meeting with Germaine Greer?

Stevens (EARB) Campaigns have done a good job this year.

Johnson (Campaigns) Re Germaine Greer, she was mentioned in the Conference report. Her agent gave us her conditions, does amount to £1,165 if she accepts. Depends on the EC agreement, there has been no further correspondence from her as yet, he doesn't expect one. It has been a useful experience. There has been a lack of branch activity in the London area, Campaigns organised the Film nights. London branch members need to be warned that further activity needs to be joint activity. The Dr. Terence Kealey meeting will be in Central London. If anyone suggests a speaker, he would say refer the name to your branch. The Committee needs more members. Comrade Jim Lawrie will be coming on.

Chesham (Central London) He has been tooting and froing with Comrade Johnson over the extent of whether it's a Campaigns Department issue or London branches responsibility. Most London branch members don't live in London. Campaigns have done well but we can't

expect to force members.

Simkins (South London) The remit for Campaigns is to take up activity as directed by the EC. These are innovative experimental aims. The topic of the meeting with the Vice Chancellor of Buckingham University is "Have we evolved to make money" from his book "How we evolved to make money".

At 12.15 am Standing Orders called for a roll-call. There were 18 delegates sitting, representing 11 branches. South West Regional Branch not represented.

9 Audio Visual Department Report

Chesham (AV Dept.) Two Committees were amalgamated, which was why there were two sections.

Whitfield (Lancaster and AV Dept.) Involved in the project to convert tapes onto digital format.

Chesham (AV Dept) The five talks of the Summer School and the Iain Bone Forum are on DVD.

Whitfield (AV Dept) responding to a question from Anderson (Edinburgh) said that the DVD can have sound stripped out.

10 Advertising Department Report

Whitfield (Lancaster) asked what plans there were for advertising in the coming year. He referred to the back page of the Guardian Guide, which had an advert for the New Internationalist.

Lee (Advertising Dept) asked the cost of such an advert?

Whitfield (Lancaster) answered £10,000

Bennett (Manchester) said that we spend £1200 on the Big Issue, according to Enquiries Department, we have 43 replies in response, is this cost effective?

Lee (Advvtg.) said that each reply cost £30.

11 Enquiries Department Report

Deutz (Non-Delegate) Queried that there was only one phone call to Head Office in the report.

Lee (Enquiries) said that he doesn't take all the calls here.

Simpkins (South London) Wondered about advertising in the Morning Star.

12 Internet Department Report

Chesham (Internet Dept.) Can't add a lot to the report, Matt Culbert the mainstay of the department. Speaking for himself, he just updates the Head Office monitor bi-weekly

13 Blog Department Report. No comments were made.

14 Media Department. The department is vacant.

15 Report of the Treasurer and Financial Statement.

Thomas (Treasurer) reported that he has in the past produced a simplified set of accounts, which seemed to confuse delegates even more. It has been suggested that because we have to submit accounts to the Electoral Commission, we could use the same format but include Form C's. Would Comrades like that?

Allen (EARB) said that at Conference last year, we decided to transfer money from the Alliance and Leicester account, where is it? And what is this about the National Savings and Investments.

Thomas (Treasurer) said that the money is still in the Alliance and Leicester account. NS&I will not take from an organisation.

Johnstone (Chair) read from the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Party Finances.

Vanni (Ad Hoc Committee on the Party Finances) said that copies of all the letters that the

Committee members had sent to each other had been sent to the Treasurer. He reiterated the Committee report, and said that Dave Perrin does not want to put all the Party eggs into one basket. I think this too complicated, it puts too much of a burden on the Treasurer or any Committee, he prefers to keep things simple. They are agreed to consult a Private Advisor. Allen (EARB) I advised Northern Rock long ago.

Chesham (Central London) Northern Rock will not accept political parties.

Buick (West London) raised an important point of principle, the Ad Hoc committee were suggesting Stocks and Shares and Hedge Funds, we need a debate on this. On the EC we dealt with this matter in two parts, immediate action we dealt with, the other recommendations, the Party needs to decide.

Browne (Non-delegate) asked how difficult it is to set up a new account.

Thomas (Treasurer) the difficulties are in place to prevent money laundering. People appointed to open an account had to go along and be questioned, it's getting them together. It's less problematical to open an account without a cheque book.

Deutz (EC) read the floor resolution carried at Conference 2008 *"That this Conference recommends that the EC investigates the possibility of opening a deposit account with Nationwide Building Society "*. Carried 15-0

Thomas (Treasurer) said that the EC passed a resolution that the Treasurer work with Comrades Chesham and Allen to open a Nationwide account and that the EC made a call for an Ad Hoc Committee.

16 Ad Hoc Committee on the Pooley Estate. No further developments

17 Item for discussion: "What system will be used to record members paying dues direct to Head Office?"

Vanni (Glasgow) the branch want things to be regularised. Members are sending money, but they don't stipulate where it's to go. They should do so by Standing Order.

Thomas (Treasurer) the forms haven't yet been sent out, getting people to change from one Standing Order to another takes time. Fred Allen is dealing with Central Branch members. Do we need a Dues Secretary? There is no check that I can do to flag up non-payers, the system is chaotic since the Standing Order sent out.

Allen (EARB) is ready to take this on, providing they are sent to him. 82 Central Branch members, 22 pay by Standing Order, 19 waived, 37 collect by cheque.

Buick (West London) due to a Rule change, previously branches could keep 20%, the rest to the Party. The only people who paid by Standing Order were Central Branch members. Standing Orders come in and we can't tell what they are for. This conference required a separate account to be set up. If the idea of Branch Treasurer removed, there is loss of contact, do we want this? Not a good idea to encourage people to pay by cheque or cash. We will have two types of Standing Order.

Donnelly (Glasgow) It's a silly way of contacting, the Branch Treasurer asking for money. Glasgow only meet monthly, we now have a Newsletter, which keeps people informed. 20 members paying dues to Head Office. The Master Form C, fell by the wayside, but it did show the astronomical figure of arrears. A letter could/should show what the money is for. May be three different accounts.

Bennett (Manchester) One Standing Order has been replaced with two. Rule 2, members pay to Branch funds. Centralising the whole thing unnecessary. Better dealt with by the Branch. Recommendation would be that members pay through their branch. If it's complicated for head Office, surely better that the Branch deal with the matter.

Gluck (West Midlands) Prefers that people pay to Head Office.

The meeting had a lunch-break from 1.15pm until 2.30pm.

Agreed to take together **items for discussion 18** "The global economic downturn and its implications for us" (West London) and **19** "In view of the present world financial and

economic crisis with reference in some quarters to the Depression, should the Party make reference to the rise of Nazism and Fascism in the 1930's which led to war?" (South London) Bond (West London) opened on item 18.

Simpkins (South London) opened on 19 and referred the meeting to Hardy's pamphlet of 1931/2. (Both speakers based their contribution on their branch statements, so suggest these be re-read.)

Allen (EARB) said that there are suggestions that this is an opportune time for us but no, it makes no difference at all. People are no more receptive.

Johnson (Swansea) The implications for us is that we get stuck in, distributing leaflets, branches organising debates. There is already an increase in BNP activity; there is a possibility of riots. Some have said a boom helps, no, we are stuck with our case. The left are saying a major war will break out, WW1 started because capital couldn't circulate; WW2 there was deregulation of capital, now looking at possibility of recession. We must be ready.

Chesham (Central London) Comparisons not helpful, there is no direct parallel. Germany had grievances, loss of territories, reparation to be paid. This is a world crisis, the capitalist class on strike, withholding resources. We are hearing about this because it is hurting some portions of the capitalist class.

Thomas (South London) The crisis underlines our case that Capitalism cannot be made to work in our interest. My view not the same as Frank Simkins, there is a danger of history by newsreel. Seeing Newsreels is like looking at history backwards, not seeing it how it was at the time. The Nazis offered palliatives, reforms. There is no economic connection between rise of Fascism and depression.

Shoedeke (Visitor) Is not 100% sure on this but agrees with Brian, we should get stuck in and try to put our message across. Is sympathetic towards what Frank has said, Muslim people in Stoke-on-Trent have said that there is a rise in racism. The BNP have more members than the Socialist Party.

Buick (West London) was disappointed that there was not a more wide-spread discussion. This crisis does make a difference, the word Socialism associated with the Soviet Union, a dirty word. We should capitalise on this crisis, now Capitalism is a dirty word.

Lawler (Non-delegate) The fact that Capitalism causes crisis, and they tend to get worse, is a fact of Marxian analysis. Capitalism still has the same problems, and they are getting worse. Hopefully this will encourage the Working Class to adopt Socialism.

Anderson (Edinburgh) Before the Working Class was blamed, now they can't blame us.

Donnelly (Glasgow) In the 30's Alec Shaw and Turner suggested going to depressed areas like Hamilton, there were crowds outside the bookies, the workers don't want Socialism, they want a job. A WW3 may create a boom period. Its being blamed on greed of bankers, there is a change with the word Capitalism being used., but doesn't see that the present situation is better or worse for us.

Parker (Non Delegate) Agrees with Dick Donnelly not Terry Lawler. The increasing misery theory has never seemed helpful to the Party. In the 50's the Party was growing. The Labour Party grew because it was said, Yes, we must get Socialism first. My book title still applies.

Deutz (Non Delegate) There are always workers who are having trouble managing. This present crisis associated with bankers, we say we don't need banks or money.

Bond (West London) We say that a slump ought at least to make the case against Capitalism more relevant by exposing even more how it cannot meet human needs rationally.

Simpkins (South London) Referred to the Daily Telegraph cartoon on the 18/9 with Karl Marx laughing. No one has said that a slump will generate Socialists. The golden period was the outbreak of WW2. When is the optimum period, there isn't one. But when the supporters/protagonists are questioning it, this is a door opening for us. Nazism was on the wane before the depression, it did happen in the 1930's. Re. Increase of misery/poverty, loss of homes, but in the third world, the numbers of people in dire poverty increases.

A collection of £124.25 was made at 3.45pm.

20. Report of the Ballot Committee.

21. Item for discussion: “Why shouldn’t candidates for Party Office present their ideas about what they intend to do, so that members can select for innovative change?” (Lancaster)

Shannon (Lancaster) The usual supporting statement says how long in the Party etc. Party Officers are constrained by their Terms of Reference but people standing could offer a little more information, why not electioneer, how are new members meant to make a choice? In some roles there is not a lot of scope, say in Accounts, but e.g. Campaigns, there is scope to inform members more than they do.

Simkins (South London) As a retired member of the Unite Union we receive information about candidates, also belong to the British Film Institute, again information is given. No point in having an election if we are carbon copies of each other.

Johnstone ((Edinburgh) As a trade unionist, thinks that there is nothing wrong with this.

Chesham (Central London) This a daft idea, the purpose is to find the person best able to do the job as required by the Party.

Thomas (South London) Tends towards Dave Chesham’s view. Party Officers are elected to carry out Party decisions and not to go off on some idea of their own. If anyone does have ideas, they should go through the branch. When do we have more than one person to fill a post?

Simpkins (South London) Discussion is largely theoretical but the argument that Party Officers purely carry out Conference or EC decisions, there is also room for an individual approach.

Reminder from the Treasurer to fill in an Expense Claim form.

22 The Socialist Standard Production Committee Report

Vanni (Glasgow) A question on Borders, Glasgow do well in Borders, not sure how many go in but believe as many as 18. Does Borders get the full price?

Johnson (Swansea) Re. Comag, they send them out, Comag supposed to pay us, they selling on average 42 copies a month. Comag should be approached for payment that is owing to us. Browne (Non Delegate) asked the cost of an all colour Socialist Standard.

Buick (Socialist Standard) We have signed an agreement that Comag can keep the whole lot, but this still isn’t enough. Feel its best to let sleeping dogs lie. We give 84 to Comag. The agreement is that 10 go to Glasgow, 8 Border shops. We can ask for a price from the Printers on colour printing.

23 Item for discussion: “The need to increase distribution of the Socialist Standard with the possible issue of free copies at such events as Tolpuddle, Burford (Levellers) and May Day”. (Glasgow)

Donnelly (Glasgow) Glasgow and Edinburgh order 100 extra copies for distribution on May Day. This could happen at Burford. We should make a calendar, plan ahead for special events/demos. And increase the order for certain months.

Johnson (Swansea) Welcomes this discussion, he has had his knuckles rapped over giving away back issues of the Standard. My first time at Tolpuddle this year, gave a lot of back issues away, would be useful to ask for a contribution possibly.

Bennett (Manchester) We gave away 500 leaflets, and back issues of the Standard and we sold two copies. Can’t see the problem in giving away.

Thomas (South London) Wonders if part of the problem of selling the Standard isn’t caused by our attitude “get rid of them”

Anderson (Edinburgh) We give a lot away, but we also talk to the people, would rather give them away than that they grow moss.

Buick (Socialist Standard) We could send extra to all branches.

Johnstone (Edinburgh) as a past Literature Secretary we have always been liberal in giving them away. Has rarely seen a Socialist Standard dumped. The SWP wouldn’t give you the time of day.

Browne (Non Delegate) suggests when giving them away enclose an A5 leaflet to save

cutting up the Standard.

Johnstone (Edinburgh) We usually have a targeted leaflet.

Shoedecke (Visitor) Sometimes leaves them on trains, we have received back a leaflet from York. The Standard is boring, it doesn't relate, she usually goes straight to the meetings page, the early Standards were riveting.

Donnelly (Glasgow) If Glasgow and Edinburgh can distribute free Standards, he is quite sure it can happen down here.

24 Item for discussion: "Should Socialist Standard editors be elected rather than appointed". (Lancaster)

Shannon (Socialist Standard) In view of what people have said it may be that we have different ideas about the Socialist Standard. There are administrative jobs and creative jobs. On the creative side, it's a good idea. Rather 19thc, we elect a Committee, the Editors are appointed, members regard the Standard as sacrosanct. The EC are incredibly cautious. The people who are the Economics and History experts don't have to be on the Committee. Why not elect Editors. This applies to all sorts of jobs, at least allows for debates.

Miller (Central London) My branch discussed this in some detail, concern was unanimous. They would not be answerable to the Party, a renegade Socialist Standard Committee could cause trouble.

Vanni (Glasgow) Doesn't agree with the proposition that the Socialist Standard make changes, its up to the membership. The articles are informative in general but getting harder to read, most of the Production Committee have been to University. Is disturbed by the idea that the Socialist Standard could be more adventurous or provocative, opposed to this, that's up to the membership to decide.

Thomas (South London) His branch agrees with Glasgow, Lancaster appears to be misunderstanding the situation. Peer review not particularly a good idea. Up-to-date coverage, or if a war breaks out, imagine the hoo-hah, if point of view valid but not acceptable to the Party.

Johnson (Swansea) If elected they would be Party Officers, under the scrutiny of the EC. The mechanism is there, if they go off the rails. He has no concerns with an elected department but sees no reason or purpose for a change when things are working quite effectively.

Deutz (Non Delegate) The Socialist Standard Production Committee appointed by the EC but from nominations from branches.

Shannon (Lancaster) His branch has no intention of threatening the safe pair of hands. If the Committee go off the rails, that could be dealt with immediately. Would like to see it be a bit more engaging, provocative. Why do we say if it ain't broke, don't fix it, but aren't we looking at a downward spiral.

25 Election Department Report

Comrade Johnson intervened to say that we are proceeding too fast, we need something to discuss tomorrow.

Buick (Election Department) The main thing in the report is whether we contest the London European Parliamentary constituency in 2009 EUR elections at a cost of £5000. There will be a General election before 2010.

Miller (Central London) His branch is in favour of contesting both big elections and the local Vauxhall

Johnson (Swansea) Is not in favour of elections. Was pleased by the London Assembly, we have lost the initiative on re-leafletting the same area; we should have the leaflet ready. The London Assembly did draw 6 or 7 responses, let's build on this, with forward planning.

Shannon (Lancaster) representing his branch, the matter of cost per enquiry, the last time we contested the cost per enquiry much higher. We are worried about coming behind the Monster raving Looney Party. Most votes aren't worth anything. We embarrass ourselves. If we want to spend £10.000 do it on the advert in the Guardian Guide.

Thomas (South London) his branch is virtually moribund. Not many members living near, takes him 1 and a ½ hours to travel to Head Office, the branch can't support this.

Simkins (South London) Gwynn Thomas is quite right, Ironical that our candidate Danny Lambert did very well. The Party was expecting to contest in the 1940's. Now we are 104 years old, now is not the time. Do we only contest when we are on the verge of Socialism? There must be more people taking a jaundiced view of the system.

Chesham (Central London) Agrees with Frank Simkins, what are we going to do? South London abysmal in their support of activity at Head Office. We might as well shut up shop.

Donnelly (Glasgow) To every 1000 some reply. We contested the European one, got next to no response. 15 out of 2000.000. He is cynical, probably should contest the General Election. The EU engenders less and less interest. For £11.000 we should try to increase the distribution of the Socialist Standard.

Johnstone (Edinburgh) At the Livingstone by-election we came last to a nut. The fee leaflets influenced us, but the leaflets were a waste of time, however we can be very active during an election.

Buick (Election Department) We still haven't had an answer, we must do something, these leaflets will be produced and distributed.

Meeting ended at 5.17 and re-convened on Sunday at 11.00am

Comrade Johnstone in the Chair, read the Fire Notice.

Good wishes were expressed for Marie Chesham, who had been hospitalised due to a serious nose-bleed.

7 Item for discussion deferred from the previous day: "The attempt made, probably from within the Party, to incriminate other members". (Glasgow)

Vanni (Glasgow) The purpose of the letters was to cause as much harm as possible to the person and the Party. When the issue was raised, the EC wanted to ignore it. The EC should have condemned the letter and behaviour.

Allen (EARB) We have no evidence as to who it was, it might not have been a member.

Johnson (Swansea) Made some comments based on his experience as an Advice Worker. The EC considered a motion, but decided against. The action is contemptible.

Deutz (EC) read from the EC minutes of the 4th Meeting: *4. A Matter of Urgency*

Comrade Stair reported that he had received a threatening letter. After a lengthy discussion the EC deplored that this could happen in the Socialist Party but felt it could not take the matter any further at this stage."

Headicar (EARB) disagrees with Brian Johnson, the Party should employ anyone in any circumstances.

Bennett (Manchester) His branch agrees that the action is entirely contemptible, but why on the ADM agenda? One view in the branch was that if the culprit was discovered and expelled, there would be more reason for vindictive action.

Donnelly (Glasgow) Is astonished by Manchester stance.

Chesham (Central London) This is nonsense, I do know that it is someone in the Party. The EC should have deplored and tried every action to discover who it was. Information in the letter could not have come from outside of the Party.

Johnson (EC) The EC wasn't shown a copy of the letter.

Stair (Non-delegate) Read from a letter, which he said could not have been written by anyone outside of the Party, it refers to matters which only a person in the Party would know, the post-mark is Hull.

Allen (EARB) has all the sympathy in the world but what was in the letter that indicates that it has to be a member of the Party.

Stair (EARB) it uses my full name, our address, car registration number.

Miller (EC) Sorry that the Party has to deal with this. Highly unlikely to be someone outside of the Party. This is not an isolated incident, there have been a whole lot of different accusations on the mailing list. It may be different individuals.

Stair (EARB) O.K. don't know who it is, but look for motivation. I have no enemies outside of the Party, only inside it.

Vanni (Glasgow) Is glad that the meeting is treating this matter more seriously than the EC. One member of the EC told me, that it was a struggle to get “deplored” used. Brian Johnson says the Party should not employ where a threat has been made. The Party should frighten off this person.

Bennett (Manchester) Said that the points made by him, are reflecting the views of branch members.

26 Item for Discussion: “What would Socialist delegates to elected bodies do?” (Central London)

Chesham (Central London) all has been said in our supporting statement.

Anderson (Edinburgh) These guidelines are too rigid, too loading. A delegate should act in the interest of the working class and will take instruction from the Party.

Buick (Wst London) He agrees with the general principle of the Party stand, these are much too detailed, too premature. No 9 Delegates are not to be on any committee or sub-committee, why not? If we got someone onto a local council body, we would have to see papers relating to the meeting.

Donnelly (Glasgow) This is an Alice in Wonderland ADM. How would an outsider see this, we have just discussed participating in elections. Journalists would have a field day here at our meetings. It was a simple proposition, we would get Socialism when we have a majority of Socialists. Anyone elected would not be on a Socialist vote.

Simkins (South London) Historically the Party has talked about this, when we were the only Socialist Party in Britain. Anderson in Tottenham got a majority vote, the other candidate didn't. The Party decided he should not take his seat. This issue caused controversy in the early days. Harry Martin said that a member should not evaluate reforms. My view is, if a minority elected, we would evaluate at the time. Road safety regulations, would we vote against those?

Anderson (Edinburgh) We could make plans, if we can get elected yes we should.

Helps (South London) Some of the guidelines contradict themselves.

Johnstone (Edinburgh) this is not just hypothetical, the SPC did get a member elected. Too soon to lay down guidelines. An MP can't resign; they must take the Chiltern Hundreds. We must wait until the time.

Stair (Non-delegate) The purpose of the item is to try to make sure that we are not compromised as a Socialist Party. We should think from the point of view of the State, what would they do to disrupt us, if we were a genuine threat? We have to be able to counteract that.

Chesham (Central London) This originated from a member of the Election committee, an opportunity to present to the Party and get feed back. Much has been discussed by the Party over the years.

At 11.50am there was a roll-call: 17 delegates sitting, representing 11 branches. South West Region not represented.

27 Report of Head Office Organiser

Chesham (Central London) Is intrigued to know the situation re: replacement photocopier? The Treasurer moving offices, 6 months have passed, he is still using the main office.

Vanni (Glasgow) Some observations, he understands that Brian Johnson will not be standing for HOO next year. When I phone I don't get a reply, most times. Though when Brian does answer, he deals very quickly with requests. It's dispiriting working here at HO. Surely we don't have to have someone travelling to London, London members maybe on a rota could do the work.

Allen (EARB) Re. The Photocopier. We had a meeting, Stair, me Gwynn Thomas. The EC decided on the cheaper machine.

Johnson (HOO) All agreed that the present machine has had its day. It can't do all the jobs satisfactory. Several firms were canvassed and independent dealers, all offered machines able to do colour work cheaper than just black and white. I reported to the EC, they agreed that

myself and Gwynn Thomas should investigate the offers, I played one against the other and prices came down, conditions changed. Xerox stood out, a cheaper machine with some useful extra offers. 5.5 per copy, Toshiba 4.5 per copy, Toshiba dealer with A3 copies. Xerox machine due to be delivered on the 6/11/08. The Treasurer has moved up, but still using the downstairs computer in the meantime.

Browne (Non delegate) When he moves up, will his computer be compatible with the Photocopier.

Johnson (HOO) He has his own printer up there. Yes a link is possible.

Stair (Non delegate) The importance re. Photocopier, Toshiba would have replaced the one there, the price is irrelevant, price per copy. Colour capability will increase cost. Toshiba would have been better because all machines are constantly up-dated. We had a good relationship with the Engineer of Toshiba. Colour copiers never colour to the edge. For good quality leaflets, we will still need to use a printer.

Floor Resolution: Chesham (Central London) and Allen (EARB) “This ADM recommends that the EC resolution regarding the purchase of a new photocopier be rescinded and that further investigations be made on this matter

Browne (Standing Orders) ADM can't instruct, only recommend

Chesham (Central London) £5000-£6000 is being spent, we want to get it right

Johnson(HOO) We got the lowest price, we even got a better model at the same price. We, Comrade Thomas and I have weighed up the differences.

Johnstone (Edinburgh) I will vote in favour, this is causing animosity, we should start at stage one again.

Deutz (EC) Comrade Allen said he wasn't able to make a contribution, but the EC had copies of the report from the self-appointed group meeting. We did consider the alternative.

Buick (EC) I will abstain on this instruction to the EC, either you have confidence in the EC or not.

Motion lost 7-7. 19 delegates were sitting.

28 Item for Discussion “Do we really need a Head Office Organiser”. (Swansea)

29 Item for Discussion : “Is an expenses paid Head Office Organiser really necessary? Could the money be better utilised elsewhere?” (West London)

Johnson (HOO/Swansea) This is about getting rid of the impression that HOO is very busy. An example of the actual work-load is. I arrive Thursday at about 1pm. And do HOO work, clearing the post, dealing with the phone calls and answering machine. Friday is administration, keeping any volunteers busy, mail outs, EC Minutes and the Socialist Standard. Has taken on helping with the Ballots and Literature Room which should be completed by the end of November. If the new HOO not involved in other work, he will have a boring existence. If we do decide not to have a HOO, the job will have to be broken down into primary functions.

Buick (West London) It's unfortunate that these two are being dealt with together. West London are not saying abolish the job, it used to be called Head Office Assistant and was about 2 ½ days a week. Clifford Slapper got it changed to Head Office Organiser. The work is not sufficient for the expense. Previous people have taken up other interests, working for the Party. If we spend £6000 per year, the Party should decide what they do. Down-grade the post to HOA, for 2 ½ days. If there is money to spare, why not pay Comrades Shannon and Windle, their work is a burden, they don't last for more than about 5 years.

Headicar (EARB) The post guaranteed someone being here, if they can do the work, it doesn't matter where they travel from. Brian Johnson says he puts volunteers to work, so jobs are there. Adam Buick has a point, but only if sticking to a remit.

Helps (South London) Is against this, as a regular attender at HO. Is often the only person in the building, sometimes doesn't hear the phone or get to it in time to answer. Worked with Stair who did a sterling job in re-furbishing HO. Brian Johnson has also done well in opening up HO, the film nights etc. We need a HOO who is also on the Premises Committee.

Campaigns and HOO should be at the hub of the Party activity, the position should be elected. Chesham (Central London) Agrees with Richard Headicar, but West London say that if the Socialist Standard lay-out members were paid, they would endure the boredom. Brian Johnson is not here 3 days, really only 1 day and two ½ days. I attend regularly at HO, there is a lot of work done by other members, who are put to work by the HOO. The advertising board is never used, the glass fronted display changed by me. Lot of work to be done. What's the object in making changes to the front, if nobody here? The EC should draw up a list of tasks for the post. The Party should regret deposing a hard-working HOO of 5 years. Donnelly (Glasgow) Agrees with a London member doing the job, we should consider travel expenses as well. Vick Vanni suggests a rota, its essential to get a reply to the phone, perhaps if we had someone here in the afternoons.

Allen (EARB) Agrees that both Comrades Stair and Johnson did a good job.

Bennett (Manchester) There are quite a number of members who spend time at HO, why should one person get the money, when others don't.?

Anderson (Edinburgh) Is concerned that work can't be found, there is so much to be done. Could man a permanent stall.

Johnson (Swansea/HOO) and Helps (South London) moved a floor resolution:

“This ADM recommends that the EC. consider extending the terms of reference of the HOO so that the work load is in line with the 3 days cover.”

Johnson (HOO) Some delegates fail to recognise, there is plenty of work here at HO but is it work for HOO. The remit, Terms of Reference are there. The Invoices, Comrade Buick does these, the front display Comrade Chesham dealing with that. Would not recommend including Premises that would be too much work. Several Comrades have argued about the Terms of Reference.

Headicar (EARB) Is puzzled about extending a remit if there are arguments about them. It's impossible to cover all jobs that could be in the remit.

Chesham (Central London) Aren't members capable of seeing what needs doing. Some members who choose to do certain things. We need an individual to do what needs to be done, whilst here. I would like 5 days cover.

Davies (West Midlands) The Party stands in as an employer, there should be a job description which could include “Work upon ones own initiative.”

Buick (West London) Extending the remit would cause more difficulty in filling the job.

Carter (Gen. Sec) Attends here usually one day a week, two on the week of the EC. Has seen Comrade Helps rushing to answer the phone. Not in favour of the Party officially employing anyone, would have liked the Treasurer to have been here for this debate, employing means officialdom, Insurance, tax work, puts the accounts work into a different realm. Extending the job may bring in the need for different capabilities, making it more technical. Would prefer for the work of HOO to be made simpler and maybe include cleaning tasks, because although people do help out, volunteers do many jobs, the regular basic cleaning should be covered.

Johnstone (Edinburgh) My personal view is that we should have someone here 6 days a week, with a living wage.

Deutz (EC/Standing Orders) Cleaning is in the Premises Committee remit.

Stair (Non delegate) We need to know the current Terms of Reference, if read it would be seen that they are about involving the HOO in the work of other Department's. How do other organisations exist, they employ people. Do we want the risk of blackmail. Any employer would want the person to be reliable.

Headicar (EARB) The remit includes opening the post, answering the phone and any other jobs that need to be done.

Shoedeke (Visitor) As a volunteer, we can't access the building. I could leaflet, can't get in. The answering time of the phone could be extended.

Johnson (HOO) Not just working to the remit, I do do other jobs. Some people will not work outside of their remit. We could have more flexibility.

The vote was taken at 1.15pm. and the Motion was lost 1-15

(To help with consideration of the Head Office Organiser post, I am adding the Terms of Reference for the job, to the end of this report. Complete set of Terms of References of committees and Departments are now on the files section. Gen. Sec.)

ADM adjourned for lunch until 2.30pm.

30 Report of the Premises Committee

Chesham (Central London) Two members if this Committee have been ill, the third lives a distance away.

Allen (EARB) Is against changing. Re. The use of architects for the front. We would have to pay them. Architects need to be told what we want.

Johnson (EC) The EC doesn't know what the plan is, if two windows, can we fill them?

Stair (Premises) How much does the Party want the Premises to deal with this. EC members have different ideas on what is wanted. Two architects in the area, who are capable of doing the job. Surely doing something properly, which would be long lasting, looking good, for years to come. Could be £15.000 or £50.000. We could have a door in the middle with two windows. One might have innovative ideas which we might like, how to help engage with people in the street.

Deutz (EC/Standing Orders). Asked if we are paying the two architects. Objects to the view that asking questions is putting a damper on things. Read out the Conference resolution about the Front of HO: *Conference 2005 Motion 9 "This Conference endorses the recommendation of 2004 ADM that the front of Head Office should be refurbished, including an appropriate replacement of the bricked area"*

Stair (Premises) The architects have cost nothing. We will get two sets of plans.

Johnson (EC) Premises have not answered the EC requests. You said you would bring it to ADM. We need to know what money is to be spent.

Stair (Premises) We are dealing with two architects, one of our Committee has been seriously ill in hospital. It's a pity wanting more sets of plans. One architect has given a price, but this is just for his work.

Carter (EC/Gen. Sec.) Wonders if there has not been some misunderstanding over words. The EC in a motion at the last meeting made a request to the Premises Committee; these minutes have been on Spintcom. Reading that the Committee proposed using architects caused some EC members to be gob-smacked. When we asked for plans, what we wanted was the ideas that the Committee have for the front, not sets of architectural plans. I have given a letter to Comrade Stair this morning reiterating the EC. request. She has heard that a firm of Shopfitters could do the work at a reasonable price, it's what they are used to.

The EC. would like to know what the Premises Committee are asking the architects to do, what they have in mind.

Motion 4 (Johnson/Wigley) "That the Premises Committee be instructed to clarify in detail their plans for the front by the next EC meeting".

Carried 9-0

(Extract from the 10th meeting of the EC)

Stair (Premises) The EC were aware that architects were to be used.

Chesham (Central London) Would like to know what the ideas are and is not happy with the removal of the brick wall. The front in the 70's was a disgrace

Simpkins (South London) South London branch wanted a slogan in the window such as "Workers of the World Unite".

Thomas (EC) Doesn't know how the EC has impeded their work. We haven't been asked for a budget, we need proposals instead of us being driven by the architects. The front is part of a Conservation area.

Davies (West Midlands) This seems an emotive issue but the world does not revolve around

Clapham High Street.

Lambert (Premises Committee) He saw the Premises report, thought it up to the EC. The suggestion of architects a bit premature. A shop fitting company would give their ideas for nothing.

Stair (Premises Committee) Its rubbish to suggest that the architects should drive the Party. Two members of the Committee met with the architects. What we quite liked about them is that Architects far more aware of higher level of design. Probably best if next year HOO takes on the Premises.

**Johnson (HOO/EC/Swansea) and Simpkins (South London) with a floor resolution
“This ADM urges the EC to ensure that the work of the front of HO is considered with urgency.”**

Johnson (EC) This needs urgency, needs sorting out. The Conference resolution is 3 years old. The arguments over the Answering machine went on as well.

Chesham (Central London) We have been here 57 years, one more doesn't matter. He wants the right decision to be made.

Anderson (Edinburgh) Feels the need for a deadline, we have the Committee and the EC, why longer.

Helps (South London) It's taken so long because the Premises has concentrated on what was a shit-hole inside here.

Shannon (Lancaster) This is what we do best, democratic inertia. Half the Party couldn't give a toss about the front, a lot of money might be spent. Let's put money into publicity or advertising. Doesn't want to be an alarmist here, but present financial crisis may cause a resurgence of the damage we had in the past.

Shoedeke (Visitor) The fascia needs changing at least. Two years ago I realised the Party was here because the door was open.

Simpkins (South London) Perhaps would cost £30.000 to £50.000, we should get this out of the way.

The vote on the resolution was lost 3-5

31 Report of the Publications Committee

Vanni (Glasgow) He hoped it would be written by members who do not consider themselves to be anarchists.

Stair (Publications Committee) Some anarchists are quite close to us, this addresses them.

Chesham (Central London) Stan Parker would like any observations on the Climate Change pamphlet to be sent to him.

Agreed to take together **Item for Discussion 32**, “Climate change, resource depletion and energy scarcity: a Socialist view.” (Central London) **33** Report of the Production for Use Committee, **Item for Discussion 34** “What is the party policy on global warming?.” (Swansea), and **Item for Discussion 35** “Will a Socialist Society be possible in a world without cheap oil?” (Lancaster)

Botterill (Central London) Stan Parker not here to contribute but it is all in our supporting statement.

Comrade Johnson left the meeting at this time, as he was feeling ill.

Shannon (Lancaster) Three different branches asking the same question, we have promoted an idea of Socialism, on the basis of abundance. We now know that may be in question.

Remembers rows with C Pieter Lawrence over Production for Use, years ago. There was a Utopianism, we should stop sounding like that. We might have to wake up and smell the lack of coffee. We are asking about oil, but it's not just about that.

Headicar (EARB) Decades of Capitalism have put us between a rock and a hard place. We know that the alternatives don't seem to exist. But arguments re. Nuclear. To decommission a Nuclear Power Station takes a 100 years, trillions of dollars worth lay untreated in the USA.

Lovelace is alarmed that waste is contained in a shed, most is not safe, it's a terrifying prospect.

Vanni (Glasgow) This is nit-picking, nowhere has he read that Nuclear is the only answer. Longer life-spans providing a problem for the future, these people don't take into account that mankind is a problem solving animal, if not within Capitalism then in Socialism. The change over from 1999 to 2000 was thought to cause lots of problems, it didn't.

Botterill (Central London) There are oil problems in the World. Under Capitalism the problems are often ignored, Socialism will not be constrained by the market. Capitalism uses the cheapest energy. The argument that we may have to have rationing, well maybe but within Socialism changes will be huge, accounting, property relations.

Davies (West Midlands) Liked Vick Vanni's contribution, if it's rationing, I'll stick with Capitalism.

Simpkins (South London) Early Party members took energy use for granted. Is sceptical about abundance. In India 80% of the population living in dire poverty. Irsome that we won't be able to have free access. Re. Energy, we can face and start solving the problems. Debate about global warming, majority of climatologists agree there is a problem.

Johnstone (Edinburgh) Our new pamphlet is just published, are we to have volume two next week?

Deutz (Production for Use Committee) The report is not quite what was intended. When was on the original PFU Committee with Pieter Lawrence, we had direct contact. Now with Brian Gardner in Edinburgh and Graham Taylor in Denmark, it is e-mails, this is more difficult. One member doesn't respond very quickly. There is lots of academic research available; we don't want to just base research on articles from the Guardian. My personal view is that we do not have to produce a plan for whole world. Regarding water, greenhouse technology could reverse the salination of the ground water in Spain. We can't have Socialism without Socialists, in all spheres including science and technology; it doesn't all rest on our shoulders. There would be a common-sense attitude. Obviously the people with the worst conditions would be the priority. Socialism would give the freedom to apply what is already known.

Thomas (South London) Thinks that pamphlet material should be more fact based. The latest has four quotes from George Monbiot but only one on the Stern report. We should go to primary sources, the new pamphlet a little anodyne, too polite, not urgent. He suggests a new edition incorporating the Production for Use report, should be more urgent, more punchy. He thinks we could go to free access for food production. In the late 60's, early 70's, 3000 calories a day, 240 protean sufficient for human nutrition and maintenance of health. Food production has grown faster than human re-production. Thinks we could have free access to consumer goods. Doesn't see a Socialist as a consumer, Capitalism without the till. Has Lancaster fallen into the trap of using "cheap oil", this means easily obtainable oil, Oil is available; it takes more energy to retrieve. In a Socialist society we wouldn't have the same lunatic waste. The United States Army is the greatest user of resources and the greatest polluter. The problem of Nuclear energy, possibility of nuclear fusion which is unproven. What we need is a Manhattan project to master fusion as was put into mastering fission. In the long run the human species may need to reduce its numbers, but we should work out a rough plan of outline.

There was a collection of £96.30p, at 4pm.

Chesham (Central London) Thought that Frank Simpkins contribution very sensible. Free access to what? We don't qualify this, a meaningless concept. People in Africa want the same as us. Need to move beyond this Capitalist consumer consciousness. No, people will not have a Rolls Royce and a 20 bed-roomed house, if you did you would look after it yourself. There are alternatives; the electric car was killed off. If Capitalism can eventually solve problems, why are we advocating Socialism.

Buick (West London) Doesn't think we have a policy or that we need one. On the question of cheap oil. Branch concludes that if warming inevitable, the threat, we concluded that Nuclear energy is the answer. Nuclear energy does not contribute to carbon dioxide.

Lambert (Non delegate) The problems in the undeveloped world, with Socialism we would

have a common identity. There will be rationing, but resources will be diverted. Huge amount of waste, waste of energy. The esteem based on what we have will change. Hardships? We will drink less tea, less chocolate.

Simpkins (South London) Free access means taking what you need. When in Spain on a family holiday recently, many flats being built for second homes.

Kelly (Non delegate) Nuclear fuel is not carbon free.

Buick (West London) Wind turbines also cause CO₂, when they are produced. People will be prepared to take social responsibility. A socialistically conscious human being will not take liberties.

Shannon (Lancaster) Party members talk about Socialism in such a way that they will not be caused any inconvenience at all. My personal view favours Vegetarianism. We may have to compromise. Level of production for most of the world is very low. The Electric car has not been killed off. Sometimes Scientists solve problems but usually in their own interests. That the age span is increasing is not true.

36 Report of the Education Department

Delegates questioned if the A to Z of Socialism is a pamphlet. It was said not, it's a handbook, an excellent document

Thomas (South London) Will suggest to Comrade Lew that a hard copy be passed to Publications for publishing.

37 Report of the Library Committee. None received.

Headicar (EARB) Has a unique collection of books on Hiroshima to donate to the library, they are historical books. Just needs someone to collect from him, sometime.

Thomas (South London) Said there might be a repetition of a previous collection made by himself from Comrade Headicar, more time was spent reading the books than moving them.

Stair (Non delegate) Be careful about giving books to the library, how much space do we have for the subject. People in the library have had a job deciding which books to keep.

38 Report of the Archives Committee

The General Secretary reported that though there is no report from Archives, the EC has updated the Terms of Reference of Committees and Departments, spread over the months of June, July and August. Archives submitted a new and very full description of the job and their work. She apologises for the fact that this hasn't yet been put onto the Computer.

39 Report of the Standing Orders Committee

Bennett (Manchester) Wondered if it would be possible to put Political items on the Agenda before housekeeping items such as the Photocopier.

Deutz (Standing Orders) Said that it is in the hands of the delegates, arranging the agenda to fit.

Anderson (Edinburgh) He enjoyed it because it punctuated other items.

40 Adoption of Executive Committee's and Party Officers' Report to 2008 Annual Delegate Meeting

Agreed the report be adopted.

41 Any Other Business

Comrades agreed that it had been a well-chaired meeting

Thanks were given to those who had prepared the food.

Terms of Reference of the post of Head Office Organiser

Head Office Organiser

Overview/General Information

Appointment: The Head Office Organiser (HOO) is appointed by the Executive

- Committee at the start of the year.
- Hours: The Head Office Organiser is asked to be at Head Office for eight hours three days each week for the purpose of section one below the days to be agreed with the EC at the beginning of the year. Occasionally, however, not all of her/his duties will be completed in that time; the HOO may therefore want to attend Head Office at other times if this is needed for the execution of these duties, or to delegate them to Comrades as s/he sees fit.
- Absence: Should the HOO be unable to attend Head Office on any day previously agreed with the EC s/he should inform the General Secretary. If this is not possible, s/he should inform the Assistant General Secretary Secretary.
- Duties: Below are the duties of the Head Office Organiser. Due to the varied and voluntary nature of work at Head Office, the HOO will also perform certain day-to-day functions of other party posts, as agreed with the postholder(s). Also, during peak party activity such as elections the EC or Party Officers will need to ensure that sufficient members are available at Head Office to cover increased demands.
- Cleaning: The cleaning of Head Office is the responsibility of the Premises Committee, not of the Head Office Organiser.

Core Duties of the Head Office Organiser

- 5 To be responsible for the security of the Head Office mailbox. To open all mail, unless addressed to individuals by name and marked confidential, and distribute it where appropriate to departments, committees and officers.
- 6 To arrange with the Post Office for outgoing mail to be collected and paid for.
- 7 To maintain a stock control system for literature and stationery, replacing stock as it runs down. To respond to sales offers, deciding which ones it is in the Party's interest to follow up.
- 8 To liaise with other postholders, as described above, and with other departments, committees and officers as necessary for Head Office to work efficiently and effectively. To inform the EC of any problems which fall outside these terms of reference. To report to every Conference and Autumn Delegate Meeting.
- 9 To send copies of the EC minutes and other circulars/correspondence (as necessary) to branches, members and Companion Parties of the World Socialist Movement.

HOO Support for other departments and posts.

Socialist Standard Department

1. To organise the dispatch of the Socialist Standard to branches, groups, companion parties, shops and individuals supplied from Head Office.
2. To arrange collection from Head Office of the copies of the Socialist Standard for commercial distribution, and their delivery to the distributor.


Treasurer/Assistant Treasurer

1. To record any money received at Head Office on the accounts package, and (for larger amounts of cash, or if requested) to issue a receipt. (For Central Branch Dues, the receipt is passed to the Central Branch Secretary when completed.) To bank any money received.
2. To liaise with the Treasurer in running the literature accounts. To dispatch invoices to every recipient of the *Socialist Standard* supplied from Head Office

Premises Department

1. To report any concerns regarding Head Office security and maintenance to the Premises Committee. To empty the bins in Head Office and put refuse one day a week for collection, as specified by the refuse collector contracted.
2. To be responsible for the keys to Head Office, maintaining a log book detailing keys on loan to party members, and the issue and return of any Head Office keys be dated and signed

for. To loan keys to members only so long as they fill an official party post, the HOO having the authority to decide which posts need their holders to have keys to the building.



.